Predicting intervention priorities for wildlife conflicts

Conservation Biology

Predicting intervention priorities for wildlife conflicts

Journal:	*Conservation Biology*
Manuscript ID	19-136.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Contributed Paper
Keywords:	Conservation, Human-wildlife, Decision-making, Psychology, Coexistence, Management
Abstract:	There is growing interest in developing effective interventions to manage socially- and environmentally-damaging conservation conflicts. Recent studies have identified a wide variety of different intervention strategies in various contexts but the reasons why one type of intervention is chosen over another remain underexplored. In this international study we surveyed conservation researchers and practitioners (N=427) to explore how the characteristics of conflicts and characteristics of decision-makers influence conflict recommendations. Using a fully-factorial design, we experimentally manipulated three aspects of eight different conflict scenarios – the development status of the country, the conflict framing, and whether wildlife killing was illegal – and recorded whether respondents prioritised one of five intervention types: wildlife impact reduction, awareness, enforcement, economic incentives or stakeholder engagement. We also recorded information on respondents' demographic and disciplinary backgrounds. Stakeholder-based interventions were recommended most often in the survey and in written feedback. However, fitting multinomial mixed logit models with no missing scenarios (N=411), we find that recommendations are influenced by small changes in the details of conflict, and differ according to respondent characteristics. Enforcement and awareness interventions are prioritised more in conflicts in more highly developed nations and by respondents with more natural-science backgrounds and less experience of conflicts. Contrastingly, economic interventions are prioritised more when wildlife killing is described as illegal. Respondent age, gender and the development status of their home country also predicted some intervention decisions. Further interrogating the influences shaping conservation decision-making will help towards developing evidence-informed interventions.

Predicting intervention priorities for wildlife conflicts

Abstract

There is growing interest in developing effective interventions to manage socially- and environmentally-damaging conservation conflicts. Recent studies have identified a wide variety of different intervention strategies in various contexts but the reasons why one type of intervention is chosen over another remain underexplored. In this international study we surveyed conservation researchers and practitioners (N=427) to explore how the characteristics of conflicts and characteristics of decision-makers influence conflict recommendations. Using a fully-factorial design, we experimentally manipulated three aspects of eight different conflict scenarios – the development status of the country, the conflict framing, and whether wildlife killing was illegal – and recorded whether respondents prioritised one of five intervention types: wildlife impact reduction, awareness, enforcement, economic incentives or stakeholder engagement. We also recorded information on respondents' demographic and disciplinary backgrounds. Stakeholder-based interventions were recommended most often in the survey and in written feedback. However, fitting multinomial mixed logit models with no missing scenarios (N=411), we find that recommendations are influenced by small changes in the details of conflict, and differ according to respondent characteristics. Enforcement and awareness interventions are prioritised more in conflicts in more highly developed nations and by respondents with more natural-science backgrounds and less experience of conflicts. Contrastingly, economic interventions are prioritised more when wildlife killing is described as illegal. Respondent age, gender and the development status of their home country also predicted some intervention decisions. Further interrogating the influences shaping conservation decision-making will help towards developing evidence-informed interventions.

Introduction

Conservation conflicts are damaging for both people and wildlife and as such, there is much interest in designing and implementing interventions to resolve or mitigate them (Redpath et al. 2013). Although conservation conflicts can involve clashes over any conservation objective (Redpath et al. 2015) conflicts centring on the impacts of wildlife on livelihoods are particularly widespread (Pooley et al. 2016). In these situations – which are often framed as 'human-wildlife conflict' or 'coexistence' problems – interventions commonly aim to mitigate the negative impacts of wildlife, reduce wildlife killings or improve the relationships between stakeholders (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018).

Recent research has explored the geographical distribution of interventions (Ravenelle & Nyhus 2017) and assessed their effectiveness (van Eeden et al. 2018; Eklund et al. 2017). Other studies have identified variation in how practitioners and researchers prioritise different interventions (Rastogi et al. 2013; Shiffman & Hammerschlag 2016). For instance, how conflicts are framed by authors, whether they involve illegal behaviours and the development status of the countries in which they are located have been hypothesized as to influence intervention decisions (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018; Soliku & Schraml 2018). Moreover, it appears that researchers and practitioners from different disciplinary backgrounds and regions tend to recommend different solutions (Lute et al. 2018). However, the underlying reasons accounting for this variation in intervention priorities has been less explored, in part because much previous work in this area has been observational, making it harder to unpick potential relationships. Moreover, as intervention strategies used in conflicts can often be contested or controversial (López-Bao et al. 2017; Duffy et al. 2019), it is important to understand the factors driving support for such different approaches.

One pathway to better understanding how decisions are made in conflicts is through exploring the social and psychological mechanisms underpinning conservation decision making (Papworth 2017). For instance, subtle changes in the way problems are framed often change how people suggest solving them (Sapiains et al. 2016). Such subtleties may be particularly important when people are making quick decisions with limited information. This is because under such circumstances people are thought to rely more on intuition and pattern matching compared to when making slower, more analytical decisions, using multiple sources of information (Evans 2008; Kahneman 2011). Furthermore, it is known, that like all people (Schultz 2011), the priorities of conservation professionals differ (Sandbrook et al. 2019) and these are likely shaped by predispositions, cognitive biases and values (Sheil & Meijaard 2010; Kiik 2018). However, how such factors might influence conflict intervention decision-making remains underexplored.

The purpose of this study is to test how particular characteristics of conflicts and of decision-makers influence conflict intervention priorities. To do this we conducted an experimental survey with conservation researchers and practitioners internationally (N=427), in which we presented participants with eight different conflict scenarios, and asked them to prioritise one (out of five) intervention types to manage the conflict in each scenario. Drawing upon similar strategies used in choice (Keane et al. 2016) and framing experiments (Sapiains et al. 2016), by offering limited information per scenario we aimed to identify possible predispositions and tacit influences on decisions. Using a fully-factorial design, we experimentally manipulated three factors hypothesized to influence conflict decisions: the framing of the conflict as being between people and wildlife or between groups of people, whether behaviours were reported as illegal, and the development status of the country where the conflict occurs. We experimentally manipulated these three factors – rather than other relevant factors such as taxa or types of impacts – because their potential

influence had been highlighted in a previous review (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018) but had not yet been tested.

We then used multinomial mixed logit regressions to test whether these manipulations and the characteristics of participants predicted intervention recommendations. These related to respondents' disciplinary and professional background, and experience with conflicts on the ground and in the literature – which we hypothesised might influence how respondent's conceptualised conflicts, and subsequently the extent to which stakeholder-interventions were prioritised in particular. We also recorded respondents' nationality, gender and age to determine the demographic of the sample given that personal characteristics of decision-makers has been found to shape conservation priorities, preferences and outcomes (Keane et al. 2016; Sandbrook et al. 2019). We then interpreted these results in light of qualitative insights derived from respondents' written feedback.

Methods

Survey design

We designed and carried out a short (5-10 minute) online survey using the platform 'Qualtrics' (qualtrics.com). We used an online survey, rather than a written survey to allow for greater flexibility over survey design (including randomization of the specific sub-set of scenarios presented to participants), to reduce the risk of biased responding (of socially undesirable answers) (Gnambs & Kaspar 2014) and to enable the survey to be disseminated internationally. The survey included an information sheet, a series of demographic questions, and then it presented participants with eight different conflict scenarios in turn (Supporting Information, Appendix 3). Each scenario related to a

real-world conflict described in the literature, involved one particular species of conservation concern, and some kind of human activity that was threatening the species. The number of scenarios was constrained by survey-length, and the cases involved were selected on the basis of: a) appearing in the conflict literature, b) having species ranges that encompassed at least one very highly developed country and one less highly developed country, and c) reflecting a mix of herbivorous and carnivorous, marine and terrestrial mammals and non-mammals (Table 1).

For each scenario, participants were asked to select one of five different intervention types, which they deemed of highest priority in that scenario. Following Baynham-Herd et al., (2018) we included five different conflict interventions types: wildlife impact reduction, awareness or training programs, enforcement, economic incentives or compensation and stakeholder engagement. Scenarios (<100 words) and intervention options (<15 words) were described in brief and consistent manner and appeared in the same order for each participant (Figure 1).

Between participants, a full-factorial design was used to systematically vary three aspects of scenario descriptions including: whether they were framed as human-human or human-wildlife conflict, whether wildlife killing was described as illegal and the country the conflict was located in (Figure 1). Each scenario was adapted from existing literature and different pairs of countries were chosen on the basis of maximizing the variation in development status (as determined by the Human Development Index (HDI) (UNDP 2016)), whilst keeping within a given species' range (IUCN 2017). The final combination of scenarios was chosen to ensure a geographical spread across world regions (Table 1). For two scenarios – 'geese' and 'vulture' – the precise species was not named as the conflicts in question related to different, but functionally similar species.

In each survey, we randomly varied the set of questions (A to H) seen by each participant using the question block randomization feature on Qualtrics. We also included questions on characteristics of the participants, including their disciplinary background, career role and position, nationality, gender, age and familiarity with conflicts in the literature and on the ground. Lastly, we included a section for participants to give open-ended written feedback on both the survey design (e.g., intervention options) and the factors influencing their decisions.

Participant recruitment

We first conducted a pilot study at the Scottish Conservation Conflict Research Group (https://www.conservationconflicts.info/) meeting in June 2018. After adapting the survey design we then recruited research participants at the European Congress for Conservation Biology in Finland, June 2018 – which was attended by international delegates with varying experience in conflicts and backgrounds. To include a wider range of responses, we also conducted a literature search in ISI Web of Knowledge to identify authors who had recently published studies related to conflicts, and emailed each corresponding author (N=335) asking them to complete the survey and invited people to share the survey on Twitter and via relevant mailing lists. Participants were invited to share their email address (to receive results) but participant anonymity was preserved. In total we received 634 responses. For analysis, we omitted those who identified as 'not working in conservation' (N=14) and insufficiently competed responses (<97% completed) leaving a sample of 427. For our models, we only including responses with all scenarios eight answered (N=411). Participants came from 52 countries (Supporting Information Appendix 1) and from across different career stages and ages (Table 1), with 84 respondents identifying as 'practitioners' or 'other' and 321 as 'researchers'. This study received ethical approval from the University of Edinburgh School of Geosciences Ethics panel.

145

146

147 **Analysis**

148 We carried out statistical analysis using the statistical programming software 'R' (R Development
149 Core Team 2016) and the package 'mlogit'. To analyse how different predictors influenced the
150 choices between the five intervention categories, we used multinomial logit linear regressions, with
151 random-parameters to model the correlation between multiple responses (N=8) from each
152 individual. We used the stakeholder intervention type as the reference intervention in reported
153 models (Figure 1), but each other intervention type was used as a reference level in other models for
154 comparison (Table 3).

155

156 Due to some missing responses, models with more variables had slightly reduced sample sizes.
157 Explanatory variable collinearity was checked using Spearman's rho for numerical variables and one-
158 way ANOVA's for categorical variables. As 'Age' was associated with both 'Position' ($F_{2,400}$ = 183.90, P
159 < 0.01) and 'Gender' ($F_{1,407}$ = 35.42, P < 0.01) only the numerical variable 'Age' was included in
160 models. As 'Role' was associated with 'Ground Experience' ($F_{1,356}$ = 7.081, P < 0.01), only the
161 numerical variable 'Ground Experience' was included in the models. 'Gender' was analysed
162 separately in models (Model set 3) without 'Age'.

163

164 We analysed the data collected from open-ended questions using the software package 'NVivo'.
165 Using a directed content analysis approach (Hsieh & Shannon 2005), we first grouped responses
166 according to whether they addressed pre-determined themes (each intervention type, development
167 status, legality, framing and taxa). Next, using an inductive approach, we added new themes and
168 sub-themes encompassing other commonly discussed subject areas which emerged during analysis

(e.g., intervention combinations). We then calculated the frequency of respondents whose feedback was recorded in each given category and reflected upon the content of the prevailing themes with regards to our survey results and interpretation.

Results

Across the analysed sample (411 participants, 3,288 decisions), the stakeholder intervention type was the most popular but most people varied their priorities across scenarios. Stakeholder interventions were chosen 27% of the time, followed by awareness (25%), economic (20%), wildlife impact reductions (19%) and enforcement (9%). We found that 92% of participants chose at least two of the five intervention type and, 85% chose at least three. Of those who did not deviate from one intervention type (N=33), 85% chose stakeholder only, 6% enforcement only, 3% awareness, 3% wildlife impacts, and 3% economic only.

Intervention priorities varied dramatically across different conflict taxa. We found that 56% of participants recommended awareness interventions in the vulture conflict scenarios, but only 8% of participants did so for the wolf conflicts. Likewise, 49% of respondents suggested economic interventions in the wolf conflicts, compared to 1% for crocodile conflicts. Enforcement was most popular in the manatee conflicts (25%) and least in the geese conflicts (2%). Stakeholder interventions were most popular for sea otter conflicts (39%) and least for wolf conflicts (18%). Impacts-based interventions were favoured most in bear conflicts (49%) and least in the vulture conflicts (4%) However, intervention decisions varied across the two locations in each scenario (Figure 2).

Intervention prioritisations were predicted by the development status of the conflict location and whether illegal activity was reported, but not by the conflict framing variable (Figure 3). These effects were consisted across multinomial mixed logit regression models which controlled for the multiple responses per individual, respondent's question blocks and the independent effect of each scenario (Model Set 1, N=411), and those that also included the characteristic of respondents (Model Set 2, N=341). Below, for each predictor variable, results are reported in order of decreasing effect size (odds ratio).

The higher the HDI of the conflict location the more enforcement and awareness were prioritised. With increasing HDI, the likelihood of choosing enforcement increased compared to economic interventions ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio 1.43, 0.95 CI: 1.13-1.79), or impacts ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio 1.33, 0.95 CI: 1.08-1.67), or stakeholder interventions ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio 1.31, 0.95 CI: 1.06-1.63). Similarly, the likelihood of choosing awareness increased compared to economic interventions ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio 1.26, 0.95 CI: 1.07-1.47), or impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio 1.18, 0.95 CI: 1.02-1.36). When wildlife killing was described as illegal, the likelihood of choosing economic interventions increased compared to awareness ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio 1.52, 0.95 CI: 1.12-2.08), or impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio 1.49, 0.95 CI: 1.07-2.07), or stakeholder ($p <0.05$, Odds Ratio 1.45, 0.95 CI: 1.05-1.99) (Table 2, Figure 4).

The characteristics of respondents also predicted intervention priorities. The more respondents' disciplinary backgrounds were weighted towards natural science over social science, the more likely they chose enforcement and awareness. Specifically, discipline most strongly predicted the likelihood of enforcement being chosen compared to stakeholder ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.47, 0.95 CI: 1.21-1.78), or economic interventions ($p < 0.01$ Odds Ratio, 1.33 0.95 CI: 1.09-1.64). Similarly,

discipline predicted the likelihood of awareness being chosen compared to stakeholder ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.36, 0.95 CI: 1.18-1.56), or economic ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.38, 0.95 CI: 1.18-1.63) or to a lesser extent, impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio, 1.21, 0.95 CI: 1.04-1.40).

As experience of conflicts on the ground increased, the likelihood of choosing awareness reduced. Specifically, experience most strongly predicted the likelihood of choosing awareness compared to enforcement ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.72, 0.95 CI: 0.58-0.91), or stakeholder ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.78, 0.95 CI: 0.66-0.91), or impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio, 0.80, 0.95 CI: 0.68-0.95). As the HDI of participants' home nation increased so did the likelihood of choosing stakeholder interventions. This effect was strongest in predicting stakeholder interventions being chosen compared to awareness ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.41, 0.95 CI: 1.21-1.61), or enforcement ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.35, 0.95 CI: 1.11-1.67), or to a lesser extent, impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio, 1.18, 0.95 CI: 1.01-1.37). Participant HDI also predicted the likelihood of choosing economic interventions compared to awareness ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.25, 0.95 CI: 1.06-1.47).

As respondent age increased the likelihood of choosing both enforcement and awareness reduced. Age most strongly predicted the likelihood of choosing enforcement compared to stakeholder ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.63, 0.95 CI: 0.52-0.76), or economic interventions ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.63, 0.95 CI: 0.51-0.77), or to a lesser extent, impacts ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.76, 0.95 CI: 0.63-0.93). Similarly, age predicted the likelihood of choosing awareness compared to economic interventions ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.75, 0.95 CI: 0.67-0.90) or stakeholder interventions ($p < 0.01$, Odds Ratio, 0.77, 0.95 CI: 0.68-0.88). Male respondents were more likely than females to prioritise enforcement compared to stakeholder interventions ($p <0.01$, Odds Ratio, 1.42, 0.95 CI: 1.05, 1.93), but less likely to prioritise awareness ($p < 0.05$, Odds Ratio, 0.64, 0.95 CI: 0.49-0.84), or impacts ($p < 0.05$, Odds

Ratio, 0.62, 0.95 CI: 0.43-0.91). In most models, the variation between individual respondents was largest with regards to enforcement (Supporting information Table S2) and generally the models explained a high proportion of the total variation (Model Set 2, mean $R^2 = 0.21$).

Respondents' also highlighted the importance of local contextual and multi-faceted interventions (often including stakeholder engagement as a starting point). Of the 166 respondents who gave written feedback, 43% described the need, or benefit, of combinations of interventions. In total 30% of respondents asked for more context or described contextual factors which would influence their decisions. However, only 7% mentioned the geographical location or development level of the conflict country, only 2% referenced the legality of behaviours and only 4% commented on the conflicts framing. Moreover, 7% requested information about the species (such as habitat and conservation status). Other interventions which were suggested included hunting (2%), lethal control (2%), and other forms of non-lethal technical interventions (3%). In total, 23% of respondents outlined the need to prioritise stakeholder-based interventions first, to either increase buy-in (6%), better understand a conflict (7%) (including drawing upon community knowledge) and to help tackle the social roots at the heart of conflicts (4%). Only 4% discussed enforcement (Supporting Information, Appendix 2).

Discussion

The results of the experimental survey suggest that particular characteristics of wildlife conflicts and the characteristics of decision-makers influence intervention recommendations. Whilst it is known that people with different backgrounds and experiences favour different approaches for conservation generally (Sandbrook et al. 2019) and for conflicts specifically (Lute et al. 2018), this

study sheds further light on these differences and highlights the possible processes and factors influencing how conservationists make decisions.

This study illuminates the importance of contextual cues on conservation decision-making. Relatively simple changes to the objective description of a conflict, such as the conflict location or whether a behaviour is described as illegal or not, had big effects on intervention priorities. Likewise, contexts which appear comparable in terms of the general problem – wildlife impacts and retaliatory killing – and which differed only in terms of taxa, types of competing human interests and types of wildlife impacts, promoted different solutions. Impact reduction efforts for instance are widely prioritised for crop-raiding bears, but are largely overlooked for fish-eating otters or lamb-raiding sea-eagles. Such contextual effects could be generated by numerous mechanisms. For instance, they might represent a form of cognitive bias, reflecting fast, intuitive thinking (Papworth 2017) and the priming effects of specific words (Bargh 2006). Alternatively, they might reflect respondents' values, assumptions and conceptualisations related to their understanding of specific species, countries, or conflict contexts (Game et al. 2013). Indeed, for some respondents, such knowledge and experience (both first-hand and through literature) base might inform more deliberative, reflective decisions (Papworth 2017). Whilst this study doesn't illuminate which processes are dominant here, conservation managers generally more heavily upon experience and intuition than published scientific evidence (Walsh et al. 2015).

Beyond highlighting the general importance of context, we also identify specific associations between conflict characteristics and intervention decisions. Our finding that enforcement and awareness were favoured more for scenarios situated in more highly developed countries, and by respondents from less highly developed countries was unexpected. In a previous review, enforcement appeared to be more commonly recommended by authors for conflicts in less highly

289 developed nations, and awareness showed no associations (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018). However,
290 that study was observational and therefore could not account for the additional variation between
291 conflict situations as we did here. Instead, we propose three reasons to account for why
292 enforcement (though generally prioritised the least) was favoured in more developed countries: the
293 possible widespread appreciation of the critiques of militarised and enforcement-based
294 conservation in the Global South (Duffy et al. 2019; Mabele 2017), perceptions that wildlife-related
295 killings are less legitimate in more highly developed countries (Dickman et al. 2015; Sheil et al. 2016)
296 or the understanding that successful enforcement is contingent upon effective governance
297 (Sundström 2015). However, enforcement was infrequently discussed in the written feedback, hence
298 further investigations would be needed to ascertain to what extent different practical and ethical
299 reasons - such as cultural relativism (Dickman et al. 2015) – might account for this effect.

300

301 That economic interventions appeared to be more commonly suggested in less highly developed
302 countries, stands in contrast with the finding that conflict-related compensation is more common in
303 highly developed countries (Ravenelle & Nyhus 2017). However, it is possible that the lack of
304 incentives and compensation schemes in less highly developed nations might be a result of the
305 greater structural challenges in providing them rather than varying priorities (DeMotts & Hoon
306 2012), despite the apparently healthy appetite for them among researchers and practitioners
307 identified here. Survey feedback also hinted at the idea, common in the conservation literature
308 (Salerno et al. 2016), that the material costs of conflicts may be relatively greater in less highly
309 developed nations – such as where food insecurity, or dependence on forest resources is higher.
310 However, the non-material impacts of conflicts are also clearly significant in the Global South (Barua
311 et al. 2013) and the social roots of conservation conflicts are likely to be just as strong between less
312 and highly developed countries (Young et al. 2013). Moreover, given that conservation rule breaking
313 everywhere is frequently associated with acts of resistance and not just material incentives (Holmes

2007) we also suggest a need for further investigation into the reasons why economic interventions were prioritised more when wildlife killing was described as illegal. This is particularly important given that conservation payments can also lead to reductions in previously unrewarded positive conservation behaviours (Fisher 2012). The lack of the importance of the conflict framing variable was unexpected, suggesting either different conflict frames are less important than predicted (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018), or at least less salient than the other factors tested. Further work should explore the extent to which conservation researchers and practitioners might be influenced by perceptions and assumptions made about countries in different stages of development, which are often out-of-date or inaccurate (Rosling & Zhang 2011).

Our finding that respondent characteristics – such as disciplinary background, age and conflict experience – predict their intervention decisions, highlights the importance of socio-demographic influences on conservation decision making (Papworth 2017). This supports previous findings that conflict management priorities differ across regions and respondents' backgrounds (Lute et al. 2018). We suggest that further work should explore whether disciplinary backgrounds and experience of conflicts on the ground shape the way decision-makers conceptualise conflicts – such as the emphasis placed on social relations (Sandbrook et al. 2013).

Although we cannot provide as clear explanations to account for the apparent effects of age, gender and development status of respondents' home nation, these factors have also been shown to predict conservation priorities more generally. For instance age, gender and regional origin all predict respondent' general conservation rationale and support for market-based conservation (Sandbrook et al. 2019). and gender can predict local management preferences (Keane et al. 2016) and attitudes to particular taxa (Suryawanshi et al. 2014).

We cannot say from our data whether prioritisations were also influenced by the factors not experimentally manipulated: such as taxa, previous knowledge, actual prevalence or likelihood of each described conflict, impact severity or conservation status. Likewise, although we instructed respondents to ignore the issue of resources, it is possible that perceived differences in management costs (Iacona et al. 2018) may have tacitly influenced decisions. Similarly, although our sample size is appropriate, our conclusions are limited to generalisations about largely Anglo-European sample, which reflects the Anglo-European bias in conservation conflict research (Baynham-Herd, et al. 2018; van Eeden et al. 2018), but doesn't represent other voices in conservation decision-making (Sandbrook et al. 2019).

These results have important implications for wildlife conflict management. Firstly, if context-contingent intervention priorities, such as those identified here, are informed by reasoned thinking and evidence, they may produce effective outcomes (Sutherland & Wordley 2017). If however, such decisions are more shaped by unknown biases and predispositions, they may not (Papworth 2017). Hence, decision-makers could benefit both from further personal retrospection (identifying their own biases and assumptions) and from further studies which test prevailing assumptions in conflict management (van Eeden et al. 2018). Secondly, given that the characteristics of decision-makers also shape intervention priorities, increasing the diversity of those involved in conflict decision-making would not only be ethical but may improve decisions (Green et al. 2015). For instance, increased female (Leisher et al. 2016), community (Mishra et al. 2017) and interdisciplinary (Bennett et al. 2017) participation, in decision-making has been found to improve a range of conservation outcomes. Furthermore, whilst different conservation managers and stakeholders are unlikely to always agree – for both practical and value-based reasons (Rust 2017; St John et al. 2018) – better understanding other's positions and increasing dialogue helps fostering more effective collaboration

(Lute et al. 2018; Game et al. 2013). Thirdly, both the survey results and feedback support recent scholarship (Redpath et al. 2017) in highlighting participatory and stakeholder-first conflict interventions as best-practice and in advocating for multi-pronged (Hazzah et al. 2014) and adaptive management strategies (Bunnefeld et al. 2017). Education and awareness programs were often cited in feedback as being necessary additions to any interventions. However, given the failures of many awareness-based conservation programs (Schultz 2011), a further exploration into why and where conservation decision-makers deem them most appropriate is important. Indeed, more targeted approaches such as social-marketing (Salazar et al. 2018) might be more effective than simple information provision, or indeed – often-problematic – enforcement (Duffy et al. 2019). However, how different interventions compliment, or negate each other, is an area in need of greater exploration by both researchers and practitioners (van Eeden et al. 2018).

Supporting Information

Further information on the sample (Appendix S1) additional results (Appendix S2), and the full survey (Appendix S3) are available online. The authors are solely responsible for the content and functionality of these materials. Queries (other than absence of the material) should be directed to the corresponding author.

Literature Cited

Bargh JA. 2006. What have we been priming all these years? on the development, mechanisms, and ecology of nonconscious social behavior. European Journal of Social Psychology. DOI:

10.1002/ejsp.336.

Barua M, Bhagwat SA, Jadhav S. 2013. The hidden dimensions of human-wildlife conflict: Health impacts, opportunity and transaction costs. Biological Conservation **157**:309–316. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2012.07.014.

Baynham-Herd Z, Redpath S, Bunnefeld N, Molony T, Keane A. 2018. Conservation conflicts: Behavioural threats, frames, and intervention recommendations. Biological Conservation **222**:180–188. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2018.04.012.

Bennett NJ et al. 2017. Mainstreaming the social sciences in conservation. Conservation Biology. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12788.

Can ÖE, D'Cruze N, Garshelis DL, Beecham J, Macdonald DW. 2014. Resolving Human-Bear Conflict: A Global Survey of Countries, Experts, and Key Factors. Conservation Letters **7**:501–513. DOI: 10.1111/conl.12117.

Carswell LP, Speckman SG, Gill VA. 2015. Shellfish Fishery Conflicts and Perceptions of Sea Otters in California and Alaska. Sea Otter Conservation 333–368. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-801402-8.00012-3.

Castelblanco-Martínez DN, Nourisson C, Quintana-Rizzo E, Padilla-Saldivar J, Schmitter-Soto JJ. 2012. Potential effects of human pressure and habitat fragmentation on population viability of the antillean manatee Trichechus manatus manatus: A predictive model. Endangered Species Research. DOI: 10.3354/esr00439.

DeMotts R, Hoon P. 2012. Whose Elephants? Conserving, Compensating, and Competing in Northern Botswana. Society and Natural Resources. DOI: 10.1080/08941920.2011.638362.

Dickman A, Johnson PJ, Van Kesteren F, MacDonald DW. 2015. The moral basis for conservation: How is it affected by culture? Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment **13**:325–331. DOI: 10.1890/140056.

409 Duffy R et al. 2019. Why we must question the militarisation of conservation. Biological Conservation
410 **232**:66–73. DOI: 10.1016/J.BIOCON.2019.01.013.

411 Echeverri A, Chan KMA, Zhao J. 2017. How Messaging Shapes Attitudes toward Sea Otters as a
412 Species at Risk. Human Dimensions of Wildlife **22**:142–156. DOI: 10.1080/10871209.2016.1272146.

413 van Eeden LM et al. 2018. Carnivore conservation needs evidence-based livestock protection. PLOS
414 Biology **16**:e2005577. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2005577.

415 Eklund A, López-Bao JV, Tourani M, Chapron G, Frank J. 2017. Limited evidence on the effectiveness
416 of interventions to reduce livestock predation by large carnivores. Scientific Reports **7**. DOI:
417 10.1038/s41598-017-02323-w.

418 Evans JSBT. 2008. Dual-Processing Accounts of Reasoning, Judgment, and Social Cognition. Annual
419 Review of Psychology **59**:255–278. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093629.

420 Fernández-Gil A et al. 2016. Conflict Misleads Large Carnivore Management and Conservation:
421 Brown Bears and Wolves in Spain Margalida, A, editor. PLOS ONE **11**:e0151541. DOI:
422 10.1371/journal.pone.0151541.

423 Fisher J. 2012. No pay, no care? A case study exploring motivations for participation in payments for
424 ecosystem services in Uganda. ORYX **46**:45–54. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605311001384.

425 Fukuda Y, Manolis C, Saalfeld K, Zuur A. 2015. Dead or Alive? Factors Affecting the Survival of Victims
426 during Attacks by Saltwater Crocodiles (Crocodylus porosus) in Australia. PLOS ONE **10**. DOI:
427 10.1371/journal.pone.0126778.

428 Game ET, Kareiva P, Possingham HP. 2013. Six Common Mistakes in Conservation Priority Setting.
429 Conservation Biology. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12051.

430 Gnambs T, Kaspar K. 2014. Disclosure of sensitive behaviors across self-administered survey modes:
431 a meta-analysis. Behavior Research Methods. DOI: 10.3758/s13428-014-0533-4.

Green SJ et al. 2015. Conservation Needs Diverse Values, Approaches, and Practitioners. Conservation Letters. DOI: 10.1111/conl.12204.

Holmes G. 2007. Protection, Politics and Protest: Understanding Resistance to Conservation. Conservation and Society **5**:184–201.

Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. 2005. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis Hsiu-Fang Hsieh Sarah E. Shannon Content. Qualitative Health Research **15**:1277–1288. DOI: 10.1177/1049732305276687.

Iacona GD et al. 2018. Standardized reporting of the costs of management interventions for biodiversity conservation. Conservation Biology **32**:979–988. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.13195.

IUCN. 2017. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2017.3 www.iucnredlist.org. www.iucnredlist.org.

Kahneman D. 2011. *Thinking Fast and Slow*. Taylor & Francis http://www.math.chalmers.se/~ulfp/Review/fastslow.pdf (Accessed November 21, 2018).

Keane A et al. 2016. Gender differentiated preferences for a Community-based conservation initiative. PLoS ONE **11**:e0152432. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0152432.

Kiik L. 2018. Conservationland: Toward the anthropology of professionals in global nature conservation. Critique of Anthropology 0308275X1882117. DOI: 10.1177/0308275X18821177.

Leisher C et al. 2016. Does the gender composition of forest and fishery management groups affect resource governance and conservation outcomes? A systematic map. Environmental Evidence **5**:6. DOI: 10.1186/s13750-016-0057-8.

López-Bao JV, Chapron G, Treves A. 2017. The Achilles heel of participatory conservation. Biological Conservation **212**:139–143. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2017.06.007.

Lute ML, Carter NH, López-Bao J V., Linnell JDC. 2018. Conservation professionals agree on

challenges to coexisting with large carnivores but not on solutions. Biological Conservation **218**:223–232. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2017.12.035.

Mabele MB. 2017. Beyond forceful measures: Tanzania's 'war on poaching' needs diversified strategies more than militarised tactics. Review of African Political Economy **44**:487–498. DOI: 10.1080/03056244.2016.1271316.

Margalida A, Campion D, Donazar JA. 2014. Vultures vs livestock: conservation relationships in an emerging conflict between humans and wildlife. ORYX **48**:172–176. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605312000889.

Marquiss M et al. 2004. The impact of white-tailed eagles on sheep farming on Mull: final report. The impact of white-tailed eagles on sheep farming on Mull: final report. 1–46.

Mason THE et al. 2018. Wicked conflict: Using wicked problem thinking for holistic management of conservation conflict. Conservation Letters e12460. DOI: 10.1111/conl.12460.

Mishra C, Young JC, Fiechter M, Rutherford B, Redpath SM. 2017. Building partnerships with communities for biodiversity conservation: lessons from Asian mountains. Journal of Applied Ecology **54**:1583–1591. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.12918.

Ogada D, Botha A, Shaw P. 2016. Ivory poachers and poison: drivers of Africa's declining vulture populations. Oryx **50**:593–596. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605315001209.

Papworth S. 2017. Decision-making psychology can bolster conservation. Nature Ecology & Evolution **1**:1217–1218. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-017-0281-9.

Pimenta V, Barroso I, Boitani L, Beja P. 2017. Wolf predation on cattle in Portugal: Assessing the effects of husbandry systems. Biological Conservation **207**:17–26. DOI: 10.1016/J.BIOCON.2017.01.008.

Pooley S et al. 2016. An interdisciplinary review of current and future approaches to improving

478 human-predator relations. Conservation Biology **Accepted A**:1–31. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12859.

479 R Development Core Team. 2016. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
480 Foundation for Statistical Computing Vienna Austria **0**:{ISBN} 3-900051-07-0. DOI:
481 10.1038/sj.hdy.6800737.

482 Rastogi A, Hickey GM, Badola R, Hussain SA. 2013. Diverging viewpoints on tiger conservation: A Q-
483 method study and survey of conservation professionals in India. Biological Conservation. DOI:
484 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.03.013.

485 Ravenelle J, Nyhus PJ. 2017. Global patterns and trends in human–wildlife conflict compensation.
486 Conservation Biology **31**:1247–1256. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12948.

487 Redpath SM et al. 2017. Don't forget to look down – collaborative approaches to predator
488 conservation. Biological Reviews **92**:2157–2163. DOI: 10.1111/brv.12326.

489 Redpath SM et al. 2013. Understanding and managing conservation conflicts. Trends in Ecology and
490 Evolution **28**:100–109. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2012.08.021.

491 Redpath SMS, Bhatia S, Young J. 2015. Tilting at wildlife: reconsidering human–wildlife conflict. Oryx
492 **49**:222–225. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605314000799.

493 Rosling H, Zhang Z. 2011. Health advocacy with Gapminder animated statistics. Journal of
494 Epidemiology and Global Health. DOI: 10.1016/j.jegh.2011.07.001.

495 Rust NA. 2017. Can stakeholders agree on how to reduce human-carnivore conflict on Namibian
496 livestock farms? A novel Q-methodology and Delphi exercise. ORYX. DOI:
497 10.1017/S0030605315001179.

498 Salazar G, Mills M, Veríssimo D. 2018. Qualitative Impact Evaluation of a Social Marketing Campaign
499 for Conservation. Conservation Biology. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.13218.

500 Salerno J, Borgerhoff Mulder M, Grote MN, Ghiselli M, Packer C. 2016. Household livelihoods and

501 conflict with wildlife in community-based conservation areas across northern Tanzania. ORYX. DOI:
502 10.1017/S0030605315000393.

503 Sandbrook C, Adams WM, Büscher B, Vira B. 2013. Social Research and Biodiversity Conservation.
504 Conservation Biology **27**:1487–1490. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12141.

505 Sandbrook C, Fisher JA, Holmes G, Luque-Lora R, Keane A. 2019. The global conservation movement
506 is diverse but not divided. Nature Sustainability **2**:316–323. DOI: 10.1038/s41893-019-0267-5.

507 Sapiains R, Beeton RJS, Walker IA. 2016. Individual responses to climate change: Framing effects on
508 pro-environmental behaviors. Journal of Applied Social Psychology 1–11. DOI: 10.1111/jasp.12378.

509 Schultz PW. 2011. Conservation Means Behavior. Conservation Biology **25**:1080–1083. DOI:
510 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2011.01766.x.

511 Sheil D et al. 2016. The moral basis for conservation - Reflections on Dickman et al. Frontiers in
512 Ecology and the Environment **14**:67–69. DOI: 10.1002/fee.1224.

513 Sheil D, Meijaard E. 2010. Purity and Prejudice: Deluding Ourselves About Biodiversity Conservation.
514 Biotropica **42**:566–568. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2010.00687.x.

515 Shiffman DS, Hammerschlag N. 2016. Preferred conservation policies of shark researchers.
516 Conservation biology : the journal of the Society for Conservation Biology. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12668.

517 Soliku O, Schraml U. 2018. Making sense of protected area conflicts and management approaches: A
518 review of causes, contexts and conflict management strategies. Biological Conservation **222**:136–
519 145. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2018.04.011.

520 Solomon BD, Corey-Luse CM, Halvorsen KE. 2004. The Florida manatee and eco-tourism: toward a
521 safe minimum standard. Ecological Economics **50**:101–115. DOI: 10.1016/J.ECOLECON.2004.03.025.

522 St John FA V., Steadman J, Austen G, Redpath SM. 2018. Value diversity and conservation conflict:
523 Lessons from the management of red grouse and hen harriers in England Gibbs, L, editor. People and

524 Nature pan3.5. DOI: 10.1002/pan3.5.

525 Sundström A. 2015. Covenants with broken swords: Corruption and law enforcement in governance
526 of the commons. Global Environmental Change. DOI: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.02.002.

527 Suryawanshi KR, Bhatia S, Bhatnagar YV, Redpath S, Mishra C. 2014. Multiscale Factors Affecting
528 Human Attitudes toward Snow Leopards and Wolves. Conservation Biology. DOI:
529 10.1111/cobi.12320.

530 Sutherland WJ, Wordley CFRR. 2017. Evidence complacency hampers conservation. Nature Ecology
531 and Evolution **1**:1215–1216. DOI: 10.1038/s41559-017-0244-1.

532 Takahata C, Nishino S, Kido K, Izumiyama S. 2013. An evaluation of habitat selection of Asiatic black
533 bears in a season of prevalent conflicts. URSUS **24**:16–26.

534 Tombre IM, Eythorsson E, Madsen J. 2013. Towards a Solution to the Goose-Agriculture Conflict in
535 North Norway, 1988-2012: The Interplay between Policy, Stakeholder Influence and Goose
536 Population Dynamics. PLOS ONE **8**. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0071912.

537 UNDP. 2016. *Human Development Report 2016*. DOI: eISBN: 978-92-1-060036-1.

538 Walsh JC, Dicks L V., Sutherland WJ. 2015. The effect of scientific evidence on conservation
539 practitioners' management decisions. Conservation Biology **29**:88–98. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12370.

540 Werhahn G, Kusi N, Sillero-Zubiri C, Macdonald DW. 2017. Conservation implications for the
541 Himalayan wolf Canis (lupus) himalayensis based on observations of packs and home sites in Nepal.
542 Oryx 1–7. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605317001077.

543 Young JC et al. 2013. Does stakeholder involvement really benefit biodiversity conservation?
544 Biological Conservation **158**:359–370. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2012.08.018.

545

546



Figure 1: An example of two different versions of the same scenario which were presented to different participants, from two of eight different question blocks. In this case the location and framing, and the illegality of wildlife killing differs between the two scenarios.



557

558 **Figure 2:** Radar charts showing the proportion of different intervention types suggested for each

559 country in each of the eight conflict scenarios

560

561



562

563 **Figure 3**: Results from a multinomial mixed logit regression model (Model Set 1, reference
564 level 'stakeholder'), showing the predicted probability of choosing each intervention type
565 (panels) under each of the eight framing combinations. Whiskers represent 95% CI. "HWC" =
566 Human-wildlife conflict, ""HHC" = Human-human conflict, "High" = "Very highly developed
567 nation", "Less" = "High, Medium or Less highly developed nation", "Illegal" = Behaviour
568 described as illegal.

569



570

571 **Figure 4**: Results from a multinomial logit regression model (Model 2), showing the estimated
572 conditional effects of each predictor variable on likelihood of choosing each intervention type
573 compared to stakeholder interventions. Filled dots represent model coefficient estimates converted
574 to odds ratios, which show the expected change in likelihood of a choice when each continuous
575 variable increases by a unit of one, or when each factor variable changes level from a baseline
576 (unfilled dots). Whiskers represent 95% CI, and variables with whiskers that do not cross zero are
577 those predicted by the model to associate with intervention decisions (effect size is distinguishable
578 from zero). Larger odds ratios indicate greater predicted strength of association. HDI = Human
579 Development Index, HWC = Human-wildlife conflict frame, HHC = Human-human conflict frame,
580 Discipline = Disciplinary Background, Literature = Literature knowledge.

581 **Table 1:** A short description of each of the eight conflict scenarios provided in each survey and the
582 two, systematically rotated, countries they were described as being located in.

Conflict scenario description	Countries	References
American manatee *(Trichechus manatus)* Conflict between commercial fishing interests and manatee conservation, with manatees drowning in fishing nets and being injured by boats in certain areas with speed restrictions.	USA Guyana	(Mason et al. 2018; Solomon et al. 2004; Castelblanco-Martínez et al. 2012)
Gray wolf *(Canis lupus)* Conflict between rural livestock herding and conservation interests, with wolves predating upon livestock and being killed in retaliation.	Portugal Nepal	(Pimenta et al. 2017; Fernández-Gil et al. 2016; Werhahn et al. 2017)
Saltwater crocodile *(Crocodylus porosus)* Conflict between human safety and conservation interests, with crocodile-related injury and retaliatory killing	Australia Papua New Guinea	(Fukuda et al. 2015)

Geese *(e.g., Anser anser, Alopochen aegyptiaca)*	Sweden	(Tombre et al. 2013)
Conflict between agriculture and conservation interests, with crop-raiding and retaliatory scaring or killing	Ethiopia	
Sea eagle *(Haliaeetus albicilla)*	Scotland	(Marquiss et al. 2004)
Conflict between rural livestock farming and conservation interests, with livestock depredation and retaliatory killing	Pakistan	
Vulture *(e.g., Gyps fulvus, Gyps africanus)*	France	(Margalida et al. 2014; Ogada et al. 2016)
Conflict between rural livelihoods and conservation interests, with livestock depredation, perceived spread of disease and retaliatory killing	Zimbabwe	
Sea otter *(Enhydra lutris)*	Canada	(Echeverri et al. 2017; Carswell et al. 2015)
Conflict between fishing and conservation interests with competition for catch and associated killing	Mexico	
Asiatic black bear *(Ursus thibetanus)*	Japan	(Can et al. 2014; Takahata et al. 2013)
Conflict between agriculture and human safety and conservation interests with crop-raiding, attacks and retaliatory killing	Vietnam	

583

584 **Table 2:** Descriptive summary of variables used in multinomial mixed logit models, using the sample
585 of 411 responses in which all eight scenarios (3,288 decisions) were completed.

Explanatory Variables	**Levels**	**Source**	**Descriptive summary (N)**	**Model Set**
Frame	[Human-Human conflict] (HHC) [Human-Wildlife conflict] (HWC)	Experimental manipulation	Scenarios = HHC (1644), HWC (1644)	1,2
Illegal Behaviour	[Illegal] [Non Illegal]	Experimental manipulation	Scenarios: Illegal (1644), Non illegal (1644)	1,2
Conflict HDI		Experimental manipulation (from UNDP)	Mean = 0.75, SD = 0.17, Range = 0.45-0.94	1,2
Question Block	[A-H]	Survey	Scenarios: A (360), B (520), C (568), D (336), E, (368), F (320), G (408), H (408)	1,2
Scenario	[1-8]	Survey	Scenarios: 411 each	1,2
Disciplinary Background		Survey (subjective scale)	Mean = 75.9, SD = 23.64, Range = 0 (Social Sciences/Humanities only) - 100 (Natural Sciences/Ecology only)	2

Ground Experience		Survey (subjective scale)	Mean = 62.16, SD = 26.84, Range = 0 (no experience) - 100 (main specialism)	2
Literature Knowledge		Survey (subjective scale)	Mean = 66.07, SD = 22.73, Range = 0 (no knowledge) - 100 (main specialism)	2
Age		Survey	Mean = 37.92, SD = 10.99, Range = 20-80	2
Participant HDI		Survey	Mean = 0.84, SD = 0.12, Range = 0.42-0.95	2
Gender	[Male] [Female]	Survey	Female (207), Male (197)	3
Career Position	[Early][Mid][Senior]	Survey	Early (180), Mid (112), Senior (109)	-
Role	[Researcher] [Practitioner/Other]	Survey	Researcher (321) Practitioner/Other (84)	-

591 **Table 3:** Results from multinomial logit regression models (Model Set 2), showing the estimated conditional effects of each predictor variable on the
592 likelihood of choosing each intervention type compared to the reference level in each model (in brackets), with effects presented as odds ratios (OR)
593 showing the expected change in likelihood of choosing different interventions when each continuous variable increases by a unit of one, or when each
594 factor variable changes level from a baseline.[a]

595

	Awareness [Stakeholder]	Enforcement [Stakeholder]	Impacts [Stakeholder]	Economic [Stakeholder]	Awareness [Enforcement]	Impacts [Enforcement]	Economic [Enforcement]	Awareness [Impacts]	Economic [Impacts]	Awareness [Economic]
HDI		OR 1.31* (1.06-1.63)				OR 0.75** (0.60-0.93)	OR 0.70** (0.56-0.88)	OR 1.18* (1.02-1.36)		OR 1.26** (1.07-1.47)
HWC										
Illegal				OR 1.45* (1.05-1.99)					OR 1.49* (1.07-2.07)	OR 0.66** (0.48-0.89)
Discipline	OR 1.36*** (1.18-1.56)	OR 1.47*** (1.21-1.78)	OR 1.17* (1.01-1.35)				OR 0.75** (0.61-0.91)	OR 1.21* (1.04-1.40)		OR 1.38*** (1.18-1.63)
Ground	OR 0.78** (0.66-0.91)				OR 0.72** (0.58-0.91)			OR 0.80* (0.68-0.95)		
Literature				OR 0.74*** (0.62-0.88)						OR 1.21* (1.01-1.45)
Age	OR 0.77*** (0.68-0.88)	OR 0.63*** (0.52-0.76)	OR 0.84* (0.73-0.96)			OR 1.31** (1.07-1.59)	OR 1.59*** (1.30-1.95)		OR 1.24** (1.06-1.44)	OR 0.75** (0.67-0.90)
Nation HDI	OR 0.71*** (0.62-0.82)	OR 0.74** (0.60-0.90)	OR 0.85* (0.73, 0.99)					OR 0.85* (0.73-0.98)		OR 0.80** (0.68-0.94)

596 [a] The values in brackets represent 95% CI and larger odds ratios indicate greater predicted strength of association and only significant associated are presented. HDI =

597 Human Development Index, HWC = Human-wildlife conflict frame. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001

598

599 **Figure captions:**

600

601 **Figure 1:** An example of two different versions of the same scenario which were presented to different participants, from two of eight different question
602 blocks. In this case the location and framing, and the illegality of wildlife killing differs between the two scenarios.

603

604 **Figure 2:** Radar charts showing the proportion of different intervention types suggested for each country in each of the eight conflict scenarios.

605

606 **Figure 3**: Results from a multinomial mixed logit regression model (Model Set 1, reference level 'stakeholder'), showing the predicted probability of
607 choosing each intervention type (panels) under each of the eight framing combinations. Whiskers represent 95% CI. "HWC" = Human-wildlife conflict,
608 ""HHC" = Human-human conflict, "High" = "Very highly developed nation", "Less" = "High, Medium or Less highly developed nation", "Illegal" = Behaviour
609 described as illegal.

610

611 **Figure 4**: Results from a multinomial logit regression model (Model 2), showing the estimated conditional effects of each predictor variable on likelihood of
612 choosing each intervention type compared to stakeholder interventions. Filled dots represent model coefficient estimates converted to odds ratios, which
613 show the expected change in likelihood of a choice when each continuous variable increases by a unit of one, or when each factor variable changes level
614 from a baseline (unfilled dots). Whiskers represent 95% CI, and variables with whiskers that do not cross zero are those predicted by the model to associate
615 with intervention decisions (effect size is distinguishable from zero). Larger odds ratios indicate greater predicted strength of association. HDI = Human
616 Development Index, HWC = Human-wildlife conflict frame, HHC = Human-human conflict frame, Discipline = Disciplinary Background, Literature = Literature
617 knowledge.

618

619